

### REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the Office action. This response is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Office noted that claims 1-20 are pending and rejected. Applicants amend claim 1. Applicants have not introduced any new matter by way of the foregoing amendments or new claims.

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103, and that all pending claims comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

### REJECTION

The Office rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting a non-statutory subject matter. The Office also rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,149,441 issued to Pellegrino et al. (hereon after "*Pellegrino*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

#### **A. Applicant's Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection of claims 1-5**

The Office rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting a non-statutory subject matter. Applicants amend claim 1 to remedy the problem. More specifically, Applicants amend claim 1 to recite a "method for a time management system". Therefore, the Applicants submit that amended claims 1-5 comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

#### **B. Applicant's Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejection of claims 1-20**

The Office rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pellegrino*. The Applicants traverse the rejection.

In the Office Action, the Office insinuated that *Pellegrino* discloses all the

elements recited in claim 1. In support of the rejection, the Office insinuated that *Pellegrino* discloses all the elements recited in claim 1. In support of the rejection, the Office cited col.2, lines 45-55, col. 11, lines 30-35 and col. 22, lines 4-10. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim discloses a combination of elements directed to a method for a time management system. The combination of elements includes “coupling at least one portion of a file to a task in a task management application and to an appointment in the time management system, wherein the at least one portion of the file relates to the task to which it is coupled to.”

*Pellegrino*, on the other hand, discloses a “computer-based education system for use by teacher and students users.” *Pellegrino*, at Abstract. *Pellegrino* discloses a “The server computer further includes a lesson material database for storing lesson material, where lesson material includes one or more of text, image, video, audio, and application program files; a lesson database for storing lesson plans and associated student lesson pages, if any, which may include predetermined lesson material incorporated into existing lessons in a predetermined order; and a lesson builder for allowing a teacher user to interactively create a new lesson plan via the display and the input means.” *Id.*, col. 2 lines 45-55.

Therefore, *Pellegrino* discloses a device for storing predetermined lesson. Therefore, unlike amended claim 1, *Pellegrino* is devoid from disclosing a “coupling at least one portion of a file to a task in a task management application and to an appointment in the time management system,” wherein the at least one portion of the file relates to the task to which it is coupled to.” Thus, Applicants submit that *Pellegrino* does not teach all the elements recited in amended claim 1. The Applicants submit that *Pellegrino* does deem claim 1 obvious. Hence, Claim 1, in view of *Pellegrino*, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 6 and 11 recite similar features as those recited in claim 1. In light of the foregoing, the Applicants further submit that *Pellegrino* does not teach all the elements recited in claims 6 and 11. Consequently, the Applicants submit that *Pellegrino* does not anticipate claims 6 and 11. Hence, claims 6 and 11 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-20 depend directly from claims 1, 6 or 11, and necessarily contain each and every element recited in their respective claim. Since

the Applicants submit that *Pellegrino* does not anticipate claims 1, 6 and 11, the Applicants further submit that *Pellegrino* also does not anticipate claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-20. Hence, claims 1-20 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. In addition, the Applicants submit that all of the claims presently in the application comply with 35 U.S.C. §101. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Office believes that any unresolved issues still exist or if, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite passing the present application to issue, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney directly at 972-917-4365 or the office of the undersigned attorney at 972-917-4363 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 24, 2009

By:           /MIRNA ABYAD/            
MIRNA ABYAD  
Registration No. 58,615  
Texas Instruments  
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
Telephone: (972) 917-4365